



Respectful, Responsible, Safe & Prepared

**JOINT SCHOOL BOARD-GOVERNANCE COUNCIL
CHARTER SCHOOL CONTRACT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
June 13, 2023 – 3:45 p.m.
Waupaca High School Community Room and [Live Stream](#)**

Welcome and Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order by Committee Chairperson Dale Feldt at 3:45 p.m.

Roll Call:

Present in the WHS Community Room: Chairperson Dale Feldt and Committee members Betty Manion, Steve Klismet, Megan Sanders, Sandy Robinson, and Becky Lange. Additionally, Board members Lori Chesnut and Ron Brooks were present.

Excused: Committee member Autumn Beese.

Also Present:

Present in the WHS Community Room: Ron Saari, Sandy Lucas, Mark Flaten, and Carrie Naparalla.

Approval of Agenda:

A motion was made by Steve Klismet and seconded by Dale Feldt to approve the agenda as presented. The motion carried unanimously on a voice vote.

Review of Committee Meeting Norms and Commitments:

The Committee reviewed their collective norms and commitments.

Review and Revise Draft Multi-Year Contract:

Chairperson Dale Feldt expressed his concerns that after looking at the GC's Annual Meeting Agenda, he noticed that Megan Sanders was on the ballot for re-election to a one year term on the GC. He had previously been advised that Ms. Sanders was moving out of the area and strongly believes that a GC member needs to be present. He added that the GC bylaws state that the administrator is directly evaluated by the GC and it also assesses the teachers, so he was concerned how that was going to be completed if she wasn't here.

Committee member Megan Sanders responded that she is staying on as a GC member to help with the transition and then will resign; it is not intended to be a full year term. She added that she does not want to leave the work behind but instead work through the transition. Committee member Betty Manion agreed that it is important that Ms. Sanders stays on so that the transition goes smoothly. Mr. Feldt suggested that rather than being re-elected as a GC member, perhaps stay on as a "consultant" to the GC.

Committee member Sandy Robinson advised that the GC will have more discussion on this at its meeting tomorrow and understands the concern and is aware that the GC needs to be very clear with the public. However, there are boards in other organizations that have members out of the area and this is not a permanent position. But Mr. Feldt argued that all boards are different, and school boards have to have members visible to the public.

Section 3.4 Lifestyle Fitness; Project-Based Art; Suzuki; Vocal Music:

Chairperson Feldt asked CEC Administrator Carrie Naparalla if she was able to talk with Phy.Ed. Teacher Cory Scott regarding the health credits he is teaching in PE. Ms. Naparalla advised that he consolidates the middle and high school target documents into the two years of teaching, but it is still short of the required number of hours.

Director of Teaching and Learning Mark Flaten pointed out that links to the course descriptions have been added to the contract for our reference purposes only, but they will not be included in the final contract that is submitted to the DPI.

Chairperson Feldt reminded everyone of the need for discussion this fall between the CEC and WHS to ensure a smooth transition for the students from CEC to WHS in health, music, and art.

Section 3.5A:

Mr. Flaten advised that this section was taken from the model WRCCS contract.

Section 3.5B:

Mr. Flaten objected to the reference that the CEC governing body may develop or adopt its own exams. Ms. Sanders believed it was just a carryover from the first contract, possibly relating to autonomy. The GC has never talked about adopting its own assessments so that wording can be stricken.

Assessment #1 – GC Proposed Goals:

Ms. Sanders advised that the GC struggles to monitor at a level needed, so a lot of the goals were written for SDW BOE monitoring purposes but others were written for CEC GC monitoring. They were also designed to compare CEC against other like schools to see where that other school is really succeeding and how they are accomplishing that so then the GC may call or do a school visit in the hopes of making CEC better; but it can be stricken.

Mr. Feldt suggested perhaps having one section for SDW accountability measures and another section for GC accountability measures. Mr. Flaten argued that it is important to keep standardized testing as its own separate assessment when looking at other PBL site schools to see what is working there to possibly replicate here.

Mr. Saari added that in looking at tomorrow's GC meeting agenda, under Item F, GC goals is listed and he believes it is important to include that spreadsheet outlining those goals in the GC Handbook. However, Ms. Sanders advised that the goals set out in that document are only for the GC and the committees to focus on. She added that the contract serves as a tool for GC members to know what they are monitoring because they do not want to have a policy manual so they put everything in the contract instead.

Mr. Flaten pointed out that we need to focus on the growth of the same group of kids, using what we can control such as internal comparisons. When something doesn't match, that's when external comparisons come into play. If everything is equal except that they are doing PBL, how are they doing things better (but differently) so that we can incorporate that into the class. It is important to use comparable data with CEC versus non-CEC SDW students.

Assessment #1 – SDW Proposed Goals:

Chairperson Feldt advised that these are the goals we want our outcomes to be. However, Ms. Sanders advised that she does not like the words "greater than"; it is just different, not better, so it should state "at or above".

The Committee then discussed changing the terminology – instead of calling them “Assessments” and “Goals”, it agreed to call them “Measurables” and “Outcomes”.

Ms. Sanders then called attention to paragraph #5 pertaining to educationally disadvantaged students which had been stricken. She added that it was in the contract to help the GC follow-up on and monitor, because all measurable pieces that the GC would need to report on to the DPI for the grant were in the contract. The Committee reviewed the benchmarks regarding disadvantaged students but did not find any. Ms. Sanders argued that in order to qualify for the federal grant, it was required that the GC show how they were going to serve the disadvantaged students.

Mr. Flaten argued that he does not like the term “educationally disadvantaged” because of socioeconomic status and wants it stricken, and instead use what is on the state report cards. Much discussion then ensued regarding keeping the term “educationally disadvantaged”. The GC members believe it is a real equity statement and do not want to put labels on the groups but instead use the more generic term educationally disadvantaged. They do not believe there is anything wrong with this term, as circumstances at birth are different for some people and, therefore, they are educationally disadvantaged. However, the SDW representatives believe that supports are not grouped into general supports, they are needed at different levels to achieve. They are concerned that all students are successful and do not want to clump students together. Instead, it would be better to use the breakdown of the subgroups that are in the state report cards.

Homework:

Chairperson Feldt advised that we will unstrike paragraph #5 for now to possibly re-word it. He asked the Committee to think about it for next time – what does “educationally disadvantaged” mean as a District? Because he is aware that the public believes there are none at CEC and that is why their scores are higher.

Ms. Sanders reiterated that the contract serves as a guide to future GC members to know what questions to ask and what to focus on with or without data. Mr. Saari commented that since the GC has a governance handbook, that would be the place to have this instead of it being in the contract. But Ms. Robinson argued that this section especially is what the GC is going to be held accountable for.

Possible re-wording was suggested, but it was unclear how that could be measured. Mr. Feldt again suggested making a SDW measurable about this and then another measurable for the GC.

Next Meeting:

Chairperson Feldt asked the Committee to go through and make comments on the rest of the measurables.

Adjournment:

A motion was made by Steve Klismet and seconded by Betty Manion to adjourn the meeting at 5:15 p.m. The motion carried unanimously on a voice vote.